

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Donny Rodriguez,

Plaintiff,

v.

Stoneleigh Recovery Associates, LLC.; and
DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

:
:
: Civil Action No.: _____
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Donny Rodriguez, by undersigned counsel,
states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Donny Rodriguez ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in East Boston, Massachusetts, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant Stoneleigh Recovery Associates, LLC. (“Stoneleigh”), is a Illinois business entity with an address of 810 Springer Drive, Lombard, Illinois 60148, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by Stoneleigh and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. Stoneleigh at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation in the approximate amount of \$7,000.00 (the “Debt”) to HSBC (the “Creditor”).

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Stoneleigh for collection, or Stoneleigh was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Stoneleigh Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. Despite Plaintiff’s parents’ requests to cease calls Defendants repeatedly called Plaintiff’s parents in an attempt to locate the Plaintiff.

13. Defendants disclosed the calls were from a debt collection agency.

14. Defendants also called Plaintiff's ex-wife and discussed Plaintiff's debt with her.

15. On May 25, 2011, Jacob, a representative for Defendants called Plaintiff's work and in an attempt to collect the Debt.

16. Jacob threatened to file a lawsuit against Plaintiff if Plaintiff failed to pay the Debt. To date no such lawsuit has been filed.

17. Jacob was rude when speaking to Plaintiff: "What do you think? You can just take the money and not pay it back? Is that what type of person you are?"

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

18. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

19. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

20. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(2) in that Defendants informed third parties of the nature of the Plaintiff's debt and stated that the Plaintiff owed a debt.

22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(3) in that Defendants contacted third parties in regards to the Plaintiff's debt on numerous occasions, without being asked to do so.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(3) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at his place of employment, knowing that the Plaintiff's employer prohibited such communications.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b) in that Defendants communicated with individuals other than the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's attorney, or a credit bureau.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) in that Defendants threatened to take legal action, without actually intending to do so.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

29. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

30. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,
M.G.L. c. 93A § 2, et seq.

31. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

32. The Defendants employed unfair or deceptive acts to collect the Debt, in violation of M.G.L. c. 93A § 2.

33. Defendant's failure to comply with these provisions constitutes an unfair or deceptive act under M.G.L. c. 93A § 9 and, as such, the Plaintiff is entitled to double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees.

COUNT III
VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT –
47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

34. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

35. Without prior consent the Defendants contacted the Plaintiff by means of automatic telephone calls or prerecorded messages to an emergency telephone line in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

36. Without prior consent the Defendants contacted the Plaintiff by means of automatic telephone calls or prerecorded messages to a hospital or health care facility in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(ii).

37. Without prior consent the Defendants contacted the Plaintiff by means of automatic telephone calls or prerecorded messages at a cellular telephone or pager in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

38. Without prior consent the Defendants made telephone calls to the Plaintiff's residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of the Plaintiff in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).

39. Without prior consent or outside of an established business relationship, the Defendants sent unsolicited faxes to the Plaintiff in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(C).

40. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

41. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendants;
4. Double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to M.G.L. c. 93A § 3(A);
5. Actual damages from Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
6. Punitive damages; and
7. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: May 31, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg (BBO# 650671)
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424
Attorneys for Plaintiff